

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 15, 17, 18, 19 and 32 have been amended, and claims 7-8, 10, 16, 22-23, 25, 31 and 33 have been canceled without prejudice by the present Amendment. Amended claims 1, 3, 4, 15, 17, 18, 19 and 32 do not introduce any new subject matter.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**Claims 1-12, 14-27 and 29-34**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-12, 14-27 and 29-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2005/0123147 ("Everett") in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0151327 ("Marlow").

Applicant respectfully submits that Everett, when taken alone or in combination with Marlow, fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 17 and 32, especially visual signals wirelessly transmitted to a receiver in a vehicle, wherein the visual signals include video.

For example, Applicant's disclosure recites that visual signals may be received from a DVD player, and that the visual signals may include video. See, e.g., Applicant's disclosure, page 8, lines 7-14.

The Examiner admits that Everett does not disclose a device for transmitting visual signals, and relies on Marlow to cure the deficiency in Everett. However, in contrast to the claimed embodiments, Marlow discloses an audio device integration system for integrating one or more audio devices with an existing car stereo system in an automobile. See, e.g., Marlow ¶ 0011. Marlow is limited to data that can be

displayed on a display of a car stereo, which does not include video. See id.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Marlow does not disclose or suggest wireless transmission of video, as claimed.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the embodiments of the present invention, as defined in claims 1, 17 and 32, and that it would not have been obvious to modify Everett in view of Marlow, to develop same.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiments of the invention as defined in claims 1, 17 and 32 are patentable over Everett in view of Marlow. For at least the reason that claims 2-6, 9, 11-12, 14-15 and 34 depend from claim 1, and claims 18-21, 24, 26-27 and 29-30 depend from claim 17, claims 2-6, 9, 11-12, 14-15, 34, 18-21, 24, 26-27 and 29-30 are also submitted to be patentably distinct over the cited references, claims 7-8, 10, 16, 22-23, 25, 31 and 33 having been canceled.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-12, 14-27 and 29-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 13 and 28

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 13 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Everett in view of Marlow and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0234081 ("Brice").

Applicant respectfully submits that Everett, when taken alone or in combination with Marlow and Brice, fails to teach or suggest visual signals wirelessly transmitted to a receiver in a vehicle, wherein the visual signals include video, as recited in claims 1 and 17.

As stated above, the combination of Everett and Marlow does not render obvious the claimed embodiments.

Furthermore, Brice does not disclose wireless transmission of video. Accordingly, the addition of Brice does not render this feature obvious. In Brice, video is transmitted via a physical connection from a video player to a monitor. See, e.g., Fig. 1. Moreover, Brice is concerned with wireless transmission of multiple audio signals, and does not address wireless transmission of video. See, e.g., Brice ¶ 0005.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the embodiments of the present invention, as defined in claims 1 and 17, and that it would not have been obvious to modify Everett in view of Marlow and Brice, to develop same.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiments of the invention as defined in claims 1 and 17 are patentable over Everett in view of Marlow and Brice. For at least the reason that claim 13 depends from claim 1, and claim 28 depends from claim 17, claims 13 and 28 are also submitted to be patentably distinct over the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 13 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Applicant has not independently addressed the rejections of all the dependent claims because Applicant submits that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed, *supra*, the

dependent claims are also allowable. Applicant however, reserves the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicant's Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicant

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11779
(516) 692-8888